

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated November 12, 2004, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 3-12, 16, 17, 20-27 and 30-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hegli in view of Winters. This rejection is traversed as the combination of Hegli and Winters fails to teach all the claimed elements, and there is insufficient motivation to combine Hegli and Winters.

In Hegli, users have restricted categories, but there is no distinction between registered users and temporary users. Hegli categorizes websites based on content (see Figure 6) and then denies access to content if the content is categorized in a user's restricted category (see Figure 5). Hegli also teaches limiting access to restricted content based on a time quota (Figure 11) or on a numerical quota (Figure 13). In these situations, it is the user's restricted categories that control access, not the user's status as registered or temporary.

Claim 1 recites "receiving temporary access requests from the visitors for analyzing the temporary access information stored in the database, and for granting temporary access permissions if the visitors have not exceeded an access limit." Hegli does not teach this feature. The access restriction in Hegli is based on a user's restricted categories, not on a user's registration status. Thus, Hegli fails to teach "receiving temporary access requests from the visitors for analyzing the temporary access information stored in the database, and for granting temporary access permissions if the visitors have not exceeded an access limit" as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, even if Hegli and Winters are combined, the features of claim 1 do not result.

Furthermore, there is insufficient motivation to combine Hegli and Winters as proposed by the Examiner and thus, the Examiner has failed to raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Claim 1 recites "said access control mechanism providing full access to the registered user and providing temporary access information based on visitor information for a temporary user." Winters was relied upon for teaching this feature. It is not clear why one of ordinary skill in the art would modify Hegli to provide full access to registered users and temporary access to visitors. Hegli controls access to content by

categorizing the content and then preventing or curtailing access to content in restricted categories. To alter Hegli to provide full access to registered users and limited access to temporary users would defeat the categorization scheme implemented by Hegli. As stated in MPEP § 2143.01, if proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. The proposed modification to Hegli, that is providing unlimited access to registered users and limited access to temporary users, renders Hegli unsatisfactory for its intended purpose of restricting access based on content. Thus, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Hegli and Winters as proposed by the Examiner.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Hegli and Winters. Claims 3-11 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Hegli for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1. Claims 12, 16, 17, 20-27 and 30-31 recite features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1 and are patentable over Hegli for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1.

Claims 2, 13-15, 18, 19, 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hegli in view of Winters and Heinz. Heinz was relied upon for teaching password generation and emailing the password to a user. Heinz, however, fails to cure the deficiencies of Hegli and Winters discussed above. Thus, claims 2, 13-15, 18, 19, 28 and 29 are patentable over Hegli in view of Winters and Heinz.

For at least the reasons advanced above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested. The Examiner is cordially requested to telephone, if the Examiner believes that it would be advantageous to the disposition of this case.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment, which may be required for this amendment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1130. In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in any petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

Date: February 10, 2005

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.